

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
<u> </u>	10/755,141	01/08/2004	David A. Kapilow	2002-0311	4769
	26652 AT&T CORP.	7590 . 02/19/2008	01/08/2004 David A. Kapilow 02/19/2008	EXAM	INER
	ROOM 2A207			CHAWAN	, VIJAY B
*	ONE AT&T W BEDMINSTEI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	BEDMINGTE	K, NJ 07921		2626	
		•	•		
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•			02/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/755,141	KAPILOW ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Vijay B. Chawan	2626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a r will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 M	November 2007.					
,	,—					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17 and 19-35</u> is/are pending in the	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17 and 19-35</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17, 19-35</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents.						
application from the International Burea						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		received.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (RTC-892)	4) 🔲 Interview	Summary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	Paper No(s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) L Notice of I 6) Dother:	Informal Patent Application —-				

Application/Control Number: 10/755,141 Page 2

Art Unit: 2626

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-17, and 19-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gasper (5,278,943) in view of Walker et al., (US 2001/00449602).

As per claim 1, Gasper et al., teach a method of generating a synthetic voice comprising:

receiving a user selection of a first text-to-speech (TTS) voice (Col.4, line 53 – Col. 5, line 37) and a second TTS voice from a plurality of TTS voices (Col.4, line 53 – Col. 5, line 37);

receiving at least one user selected voice characteristic (Col.4, line 53 – Col. 5, line 37).

However, Gasper et al., do not specifically teach generating a new TTS voice and the second TTS voice and according to the user selected voice characteristic.

Walker et al., do teach generating a new TTS voice and the second TTS voice and according to the user selected voice characteristic (Fig.1, synthesized audio, Fig.2).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to include the capability of generating a new TTS voice as taught by

Application/Control Number: 10/755,141

Art Unit: 2626

Walker et al., in the method of Gasper et al., because this would enhance the quality of TTS conversion of the text into speech.

As per claim 2, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 1, further comprising: presenting the new TTS voice to the user for preview, receiving user-selected adjustments, and, presenting a revised TTS voice to the user for preview according to the user-selected adjustments (Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 3, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 1, wherein generating the new TTS voice further comprises interpolating between corresponding segment parameters of the first TTS voice and the second TTS voice (Walker et al., Fig.1, synthesized audio, Fig.2).

As per claim 4, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 1, wherein the user-selected voice characteristic relates to mis-pronunciations (Gasper et al., Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 5, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 3, wherein the segment parameters relate to prosodic characteristics (Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 6, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 5, wherein the prosodic characteristics are selected from a group comprising pitch contour, spectral envelope, volume contour and phone durations (Gasper et al., Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 7, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 6, wherein the prosodic characteristics are further selected from a group comprising

Application/Control Number: 10/755,141

Art Unit: 2626

syllable accent, stress and emotion (Gasper et al., Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 8, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 1, wherein blending the first TTS voice and the second TTS voice further comprises extracting a prosodic characteristic from the LPC residual of the first TTS voice and the LPC residual of the second TTS voice and interpolating between the extracted prosodic characteristics (Gasper et al., Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65, Col.4, line 53 – Col. 5, line 37).

As per claim 9, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 8, wherein the prosodic characteristic is pitch, wherein the interpolation of the extracted pitches from the first TTS voice and the second TTS voice generates a new blended pitch (Gasper et al., Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 10, Gasper et al., in view Walker et al., teach a method of generating a synthetic voice, the method comprising: receiving a user selection of TTS voice and a voice characteristic, and presenting the user with a new TTS voice comprising the selected TTS voice blended with at least one other TTS voice to achieve the selected voice characteristic (Col.4, line 53 – Col. 5, line 37, Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

However, Gasper et al., do not specifically teach generating a new TTS voice and the second TTS voice and according to the user selected voice characteristic.

Walker et al., do teach generating a new TTS voice and the second TTS voice and according to the user selected voice characteristic (Fig.1, synthesized audio, Fig.2).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to include the capability of generating a new TTS voice as taught by Walker et al., in the method of Gasper et al., because this would enhance the quality of TTS conversion of the text into speech.

As per claim 11, Gasper et al., Walker et al., teach the method of claim 10, further comprising: presenting the new TTS voice to the user for preview, receiving user-selected adjustments, and presenting a revised TTS voice to the user for preview according to the user-selected adjustments (0030 - 0041).

As per claim 12, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 10, wherein generating the new TTS voice further comprises interpolating between corresponding segment parameters of the first TTS voice and the at least one other voice (Walker et al., 0030 - 0041).

As per claim 13, Gasper et al., Walker et al., teach the method of claim 11, wherein the segment parameters relate to prosodic characteristics (Gasper et al., Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 14, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 13, wherein the prosodic characteristics are selected from a group comprising pitch contour, spectral envelope, volume contour and phone durations (Gasper et al., Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 15, Gasper et al., in view Walker et al., teach the method of claim 14, wherein the prosodic characteristics are further selected from a group comprising

Application/Control Number: 10/755,141

Art Unit: 2626

syllable accent, stress and emotion (Gasper et al., Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 16, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 10, wherein the blended voice is generated by extracting a prosodic characteristic from the LPC residual of the first TTS voice and the LPC residual of the second TTS voice and interpolating between the extracted prosodic characteristics (Col.4, line 53 – Col. 5, line 37).

As per claim 17, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 10, wherein the user-selected voice is blended with a plurality of other TTS voices to generate the new TTS voice (0030 - 0041).

As per claim 19, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 16, wherein the prosodic characteristic is pitch, wherein the interpolation of the extracted pitches from the first TTS voice and the second TTS voice generates a new blended pitch ((Col.4, line 53 – Col. 5, line 37, Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

As per claim 20, Gasper et al., in view of Walker et al., teach the method of claim 10, wherein the voice characteristics relate to mispronunciations (Col.4, line 53 – Col. 5, line 37, Col.5, lines 50-64, Col.6, lines 58-65).

Claims 21-27 are system claims to implement the method of claims 1-10, and are similar in scope and content and are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 28-35 are method claims similar in scope and content of claims 1-20 and are rejected under similar rationale.

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 and 19-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached PTO-892 form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vijay B. Chawan whose telephone number is (571) 272-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Friday 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vijay B. Chawan Primary Examiner Art Unit 2626

VIJAY CHAWAN PRIMARY EXAMINER

vbc 2/13/08